arXiv:1611.09033v1 [math.CO] 28 Nov 2016

Triangulability of Convex Graphs and Convex Skewness

Niran Abbas Ali[a], Gek L. Chia[b,e], Hazim Michman Trao[c] and Adem Kilicman[d]

[a,c,d]*Department of Mathematics, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 Serdang, Malaysia,*

[b]*Department of Mathematical and Actuarial Sciences, Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, Sungai Long Campus, Malaysia*

[e]*Institute of Mathematical Sciences, University of Malaya, 50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia*

Abstract

Motivated by a result of [1] which states that if F is a subgraph of a convex complete graph K_n and F contains no boundary edge of K_n and $|E(F)| \leq n-3$, then $K_n - F$ admits a triangulation, we determine necessary and sufficient conditions on F with $|E(F)| \leq n-1$ for which the conclusion remains true. For $|E(F)| \geq n$, we investigate the possibility of packing F in K_n such that $K_n - F$ admits a triangulation for certain families of graphs F. These results are then applied to determine the convex skewness of the convex graphs of the form $K_n - F$.

1 Introduction and Preliminary

By a *geometric graph* we mean a graph whose edges are straight line segments. By a *convex graph*, we mean a geometric graph whose vertices are in convex position. Let G be a geometric graph with n vertices having k vertices in the convex hull. By a *triangulation of* G we mean a maximal planar subdivision with the vertex set $V(G)$ of G. Hence a triangulation of G has $2n-2-k$ triangles and $3n-3-k$ edges. It has been shown in [8] that the problem of deciding whether a given geometric graph admits a triangulation of its vertex set is an NP-complete problem.

For the case where G is a convex geometric graph, it has been proved in [1] that G admits a triangulation if G is obtained from the complete convex graph K_n by deleting a set F of at most $n-3$ edges and F contains no edges from the boundary of the convex hull of G (see Theorem 1). It was noted that the result is best possible with respect to the number of edges in G. Motivated by this, we wish to obtain conditions on F for which the result remains true when F has more than $n-3$ edges.

Throughout, if F is subgraph of K_n, then $K_n - F$ will denote the convex graph obtained from K_n by deleting the set of edges of F.

Theorem 1 *([1] (Theorem 4.1))*
Let F be a subgraph of a convex complete graph K_n. Suppose F contains no boundary edge of K_n and $|E(F)| \leq n-3$. Then $K_n - F$ admits a triangulation.

For F having at most $n-1$ edges, we obtain necessary and sufficient conditions on F such that $K_n - F$ admits a triangulation. These conditions are given in Propositions 1 and 2, and Theorems 2 and 3.

The case where F has at least n edges seems to be a little complicated. For this we turn to look for a configuration for F that can be packed in K_n so that $K_n - F$ admits a triangulation. If such a configuration exists for F, then we say that F is *potentially triangulable in* K_n. Potentially triangulable graphs are considered in Section 4 where we (i) determine precisely the value of n for which the n-cycle is potentially triangulable in K_n (Theorem 4), and (ii) characterize all 2-regular graphs which are potentially triangulable in K_n (Theorem 5).

The potentially triangulable problem is extended to the regular case in Section 5. Here, while unable to solve the general case, we consider the generalized Petersen graph.

We end the paper by showing an application of these result to the problem of determining the minimum number of edges to be deleted from a given convex graph so that the resulting graph is a convex plane graph.

Throughout, we shall adopt the following notations. Unless otherwise stated, the vertices of a convex complete graph K_n will be denoted by $v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{n-1}$ in cyclic ordered. Also, unless otherwise specified, any operation on the subscript of v_i is reduced modulo n.

Lemma 1 *Let F be a subgraph of a convex complete graph K_n. Assume that F has at most $n-1$ edges and having no boundary edge of K_n. Then $K_n - F$ has a vertex v_i such that $v_{i-1}v_{i+1}$ is not an edge of F.*

Proof: If the lemma is not true, then it implies that $v_{i-1}v_{i+1}, v_{i-2}v_i, v_iv_{i+2} \in E(F)$, and recursively, this implies that F is a spanning subgraph of K_n with minimum vertex-degree at least 2. But this implies that $|E(F)| \geq n$, a contradiction. □

2 Graphs with at most $n-2$ edges

We begin by describing a configuration for F_n with n vertices and $n-2$ edges such that $K_n - F$ admits no triangulation.

Definition 1 *Let F_n denote a subgraph of K_n with no isolated vertices and having $n-2$ edges. Let $\mathcal{F}_n(^*)$ denote a configuration of F_n on K_n such that either $E(\mathcal{F}_n(^*)) = \{v_0v_i, v_1v_{n-1} \mid i = 2, 3, \ldots, n-2\}$ or else $\mathcal{F}_n(^*)$ satisfies the following conditions:*

(i) For $i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$, $d(v_i) \geq 2$ and $v_{i-1}v_{i+1} \in E(\mathcal{F}_n(^*))$ where k is some natural number with $2 \leq k \leq n-4$.

(ii) For $i = k, k+1, \ldots, n-1$, $d(v_i) = 1$ and v_i is adjacent to some non-pendant vertex in $\mathcal{F}_n(^*)$.

(iii) For any two pendant vertices u, v such that uv_i and vv_j are crossed in $\mathcal{F}_n(^*)$, then $|i-j|=1$.

Example 1 *Let F be a subgraph be a subgraph of K_{10} with vertex set $\{v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_9\}$ and edge set $\{v_0v_2, v_0v_8, v_1v_3, v_1v_7, v_1v_9, v_3v_5, v_3v_6, v_2v_4\}$. Then F is an example of a $\mathcal{F}_{10}(^*)$ configuration in K_{10}. Here $k=4$.*

Note that in the above definition of $\mathcal{F}_n(^*)$, if $w \in \{v_0, v_{k-1}\}$, then w is adjacent to some pendant vertex of $\mathcal{F}_n$.

Proposition 1 *Suppose F_n is a subgraph of the convex complete graph K_n with a configuration $\mathcal{F}_n(^*)$ as defined above. Then $K_n - \mathcal{F}_n(^*)$ admits no triangulation for any natural number $n \geq 4$.*

Proof: We prove this by induction on n. The result is clearly true if $4 \leq n \leq 6$. Hence we assume that $n \geq 7$ and that the result is true for all convex graphs $K_m - \mathcal{F}_m(^*)$ where $m < n$.

By Lemma 1, $K_n - \mathcal{F}_n(^*)$ contains a vertex v_i such that $v_{i-1}v_{i+1} \notin E(\mathcal{F}_n(^*))$. By the definition of $\mathcal{F}_n(^*)$, we see that $d_{\mathcal{F}_n(^*)}(v_i) = 1$.

Let $F_{n-1} = \mathcal{F}_n(^*) - v_i$ and consider $K_{n-1} - F_{n-1}$. We shall show that F_{n-1} is a subgraph of K_{n-1} with the configuration $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$.

Let v_j be the neighbor of v_i in F_n.

Case (1): $d_{F_{n-1}}(v_j) \geq 2$.

Clearly $F_{n-1} = \mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$ if $i \geq j+3$ (otherwise $F_n \neq \mathcal{F}_n(^*)$). So assume that $i = j+2$.

If $d_{F_n}(v_{j+1}) = 1$, then $v_j = v_{k-1}$ and we have $F_{n-1} = \mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$ by definition.

If $d_{F_n}(v_{j+1}) \geq 2$, then $v_{j+1} = v_{k-1}$ (since $v_{j+2} = v_i$ is a pendant vertex). Hence v_{j+1} is adjacent to some pendant vertex v_r of F_n where $r \in \{j+4, \ldots, n-1\}$.

Suppose $v_jv_{j+3} \notin E(F_{n-1})$. Then v_{j+3} is adjacent to some vertex v_s where $s \in \{0, 1, \ldots, j-1\}$ with $d_{F_n}(v_s) \geq 2$. But this contradicts condition (iii) (in the definition of $\mathcal{F}_n(^*)$) since $v_{j+3}v_s$ crosses v_rv_{j+1} and $s \neq j$.

Hence $v_jv_{j+3} \in E(F_{n-1})$ and it follows that $F_{n-1} = \mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$ in this case.

Case (2): $d_{F_{n-1}}(v_j) = 1$.

In this case, $d_{F_n}(v_j) = 2$. We assert that $j \in \{0, k-1\}$.

Suppose $1 \leq j \leq k-2$. Since v_{j-1}, v_{j+1} are non-pendant vertices of $\mathcal{F}_n(^*)$, it follows that v_{j-2}, v_{j+2} are the only neighbors of v_j in $\mathcal{F}_n(^*)$. Assume without loss of generality that $v_i = v_{j+2}$. Hence $v_{j+1} = v_{k-1}$ is adjacent to a pendant vertex v_r where $r \in \{j+4, \ldots, n-1\}$. Now the pendant vertex v_{j+3} is adjacent to some non-pendant

vertex v_s where $s \in \{0, 1, \ldots, j-1\}$. But then $v_{j+3}v_s, v_rv_{j+1}$ are crossing each other and $s \neq j$, a contradiction to condition (iii) in the definition of $\mathcal{F}_n(^*)$. This proves the assertion.

Assume without loss of generality that $j = k-1$. Then clearly $F_{n-1} = \mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$.

By induction $K_{n-1} - \mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$ admits no triangulation.

Assume on the contrary that $K_n - \mathcal{F}_n(^*)$ admits a triangulation T_n.

(i) Suppose T_n contains $v_{i-1}v_{i+1}$. Then v_i is a degree-2 vertex in T_n. Hence $T_n - v_i$ is a triangulation for $K_{n-1} - \mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$, a contradiction.

(ii) Suppose T_n does not contain $v_{i-1}v_{i+1}$. Then v_iv_t is a diagonal in T_n and v_iv_t divides $K_n - F_n(^*)$ into $K_{m_1} - F_{m_1}$ and $K_{m_2} - F_{m_2}$ where $m_1 + m_2 - 2 = n$. Without loss of generality assume that v_iv_j is an edge in F_{m_1}. Then it is readily checked that $F_{m_1} = \mathcal{F}_{m_1}(^*)$. By induction $K_{m-1} - \mathcal{F}_{m_1}(^*)$ admits no triangulation, a contradiction.

This completes the proof. □

The following result together with Proposition 1 characterize all graphs F_n with at most $n-2$ edges such that $K_n - F_n$ admits a triangulation.

Theorem 2 *Suppose $n \geq 6$ is a natural number and F_n is a subgraph of the convex complete graph K_n such that $|E(F_n)| \leq n-2$ and F_n contains no boundary edges of K_n. Then $K_n - F_n$ admits a triangulation unless $F_n = \mathcal{F}_n(^*)$.*

Proof: In view of Proposition 1, we assume that $F_n \neq \mathcal{F}_n(^*)$.

We prove the result by induction on n. The result is clearly true if $n = 6$. Assume that $n \geq 7$ and the result is true for all convex graphs $K_m - F_m$ where $m < n$.

By Lemma 1, $K_n - F_n$ contains a vertex v_i such that $v_{i-1}v_{i+1} \notin E(F_n)$. $(*)$

Let v_i which satisfies the condition in $(*)$ be such that $d_{F_n}(v_i) = k$ is maximal.

Delete the vertex v_i from $K_n - F_n$. The resulting graph is a convex graph of the form $K_{n-1} - F_{n-1}$ where $F_{n-1} = F_n - v_i$ is a subgraph of K_{n-1}.

Case (1): $k \geq 2$.

Then $|E(F_{n-1})| \leq n-4$. Clearly F_{n-1} does not admit the configuration $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$. By induction $K_{n-1} - F_{n-1}$ admits a triangulation T_{n-1}. As such $T_{n-1} \cup \{v_{i-1}v_i, v_iv_{i+1}\}$ is a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$.

Case (2): $k = 1$.

Let v_j be the neighbor of v_i in F_n.

If $d_{F_n}(v_j) = 1$, then v_j is an isolated vertex in F_{n-1} which implies that $K_{n-1} - F_{n-1}$ admits a triangulation T_{n-1}. Again $T_{n-1} \cup \{v_{i-1}v_i, v_iv_{i+1}\}$ is a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$.

Hence assume that $d_{F_n}(v_j) \geq 2$.

If $F_{n-1} \neq \mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$, then $K_{n-1} - F_{n-1}$ admits a triangulation T_{n-1} by induction. Again $T_{n-1} \cup \{v_{i-1}v_i, v_iv_{i+1}\}$ is a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$.

Hence we assume that $F_{n-1} = \mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$.

In view of the maximality on $d_{F_n}(v_i) = k$, we see that v_{i-1}, v_{i+1} are both pendant vertices in F_n (otherwise $F_n = \mathcal{F}_n(^*)$). Let v_s and v_t be the neighbors of v_{i-1} and v_{i+1} in F_n respectively.

If v_iv_j crosses neither $v_{i-1}v_s$ nor $v_{i+1}v_t$, then $F_n = \mathcal{F}_n(^*)$, a contradiction.

Hence we assume without loss of generality that v_iv_j crosses $v_{i-1}v_s$ and that $s < j < i$.

If $|s - j| = 1$, then we have $F_n = \mathcal{F}_n(^*)$, a contradiction.

If $|s - j| > 1$, a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$ is given by the set of diagonals $v_{i-1}v_{j-1}$, $v_{i-1}v_l$ where $l \in \{j, j+1, \ldots, i-3\} = A$ and v_iv_m for all $m \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, n-1\} - (A \cup \{i-2, i-1, i, i+1\})$.

This completes the proof. □

3 Graphs with only $n - 1$ edges

We begin by describing a configuration for F_n with n vertices and $n-1$ edges such that $K_n - F$ admits no triangulation.

Definition 2 *Let F_n denote a subgraph of K_n with no isolated vertices and having $n-1$ edges where $n \geq 5$. Let $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ denote a configuration of F_n on K_n such that (i) whenever $v_{i-1}v_{i+1} \notin E(\mathcal{J}_n(^*))$, then $d_{F_n}(v_i) \leq 2$, and (ii) in the case that $d_{F_n}(v_i) = 2$, then $\mathcal{J}_n(^*) - v_i = \mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$ in $K_n - v_i$.*

Suppose $k \in \{1, 2\}$. Let $J_{n,k}$ denote the set of all degree-k vertices in $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ satisfying the conditions (i) and (ii) in Definition 2. Note that if $v \in J_{n,2}$, then no neighbor of v is a pendant vertex in $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$.

Definition 3 *The configuration $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ is said to be of* Type-1 *if $J_{n,2} = \emptyset$ and there is an edge e in $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ such that $\mathcal{J}_n(^*) - e$ is $\mathcal{F}_n(^*)$. The configuration $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ is said to be of* Type-2 *if (i) $J_{n,2} \neq \emptyset$ and (ii) whenever $v_i \in J_{n,2}$ and v_t is a pendant vertex in $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ such that v_tv_s crosses $v_iv_{j_1}$ and $v_iv_{j_2}$, then either $|j_1 - s| = 1$ or $|j_2 - s| = 1$.*

Example 2 *(i) Let F be a subgraph of K_{11} with vertex set $\{v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{10}\}$ and edge set $\{v_0v_2, v_0v_3, v_0v_7, v_0v_9, v_1v_3, v_1v_8, v_1v_{10}, v_2v_4, v_2v_6, v_3v_5\}$. Then F is an example of a $\mathcal{J}_{11}(^*)$ configuration in K_{11}. Here $J_{11,1} = \{v_5, v_6, \ldots, v_9\}$ and $J_{11,2} = \emptyset$. Hence F is of Type-1. Note that $\mathcal{J}_{11}(^*) - \{v_0v_3\} \cong \mathcal{F}_{11}(^*)$.*

(ii) Let F be a subgraph of K_{11} with vertex set $\{v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{10}\}$ and edge set $\{v_0v_2, v_0v_7, v_0v_9, v_1v_3, v_1v_8, v_1v_{10}, v_2v_4, v_2v_6, v_3v_5, v_5v_9\}$. Then F is an example of a $\mathcal{J}_{11}(^*)$ configuration in K_{11}. Here $J_{11,1} = \{v_6, v_7, v_8\}$ and $J_{11,2} = \{v_5, v_9\}$. Hence F of Type-2.

We shall define three $\mathcal{J}_6(^*)$ configurations J_1, J_2, J_3 (on K_6) each of Type-2 with $J_{6,1} = \emptyset$. Let $J_1 = v_1v_4v_2v_5v_1 \cup \{v_0v_3\}$, $J_2 = v_1v_3v_5v_1 \cup \{v_0v_2, v_1v_4\}$ and $J_3 = v_1v_3v_5v_1 \cup v_2v_0v_4$.

Lemma 2 *Suppose F_6 is a Type-2 $\mathcal{J}_6(^*)$. Then $J_{6,1} = \emptyset$ if and only if $F_6 = J_i$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Moreover $K_6 - J_i$ admits no triangulation for any $i = 1, 2, 3$.*

Proof: The sufficiency is clear. We shall prove the necessity.

Note that, for any $v \in J_{6,2}$, $\mathcal{J}_6(^*) - v = \mathcal{F}_5(^*)$. Note also that there is only one configuration of $\mathcal{F}_5(^*)$ on K_5 which is given by $E(\mathcal{F}_5(^*)) = \{x_0x_2, x_1x_3, x_1x_4\}$.

Now, there are only three possible ways to place v on the boundary edge of K_5 (in order to recover $\mathcal{J}_6(^*)$ from $\mathcal{F}_5(^*)$). Without loss of generality, assume that v lies on the edge x_ix_{i+1} for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. In each case, we join v to two vertices of $\mathcal{F}_5(^*)$ subject to the condition that $J_{6,1} = \emptyset$. We then arrive at the conclusion that $F_6 = J_i$, $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

Suppose on the contrary that $K_6 - J_i$ admits a triangulation T_i. For any $v_j \in J_{6,2}$, the edge $v_{j-1}v_{j+1}$ is not a diagonal edge in T_i (because $J_i - v_j = \mathcal{F}_5(^*)$). Hence v_jv_t, for some vertex v_t (not adjacent to v_j) in J_i, is a diagonal edge in T_i. But then it is routine to check that v_jv_t cannot be combined with another two non-adjacent edges in J_i to form the set of diagonal edges of T_i, a contradiction. □

Lemma 3 *Suppose F_n is a Type-2 $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ configuration and $n \geq 7$, If $J_{n,1} = \emptyset$, then for each $v_i \in J_{n,2}$, $v_{i-2}v_i, v_iv_{i+2} \in E(\mathcal{J}_n(^*))$.*

Proof: Since $v_i \in J_{n,2}$, we have $\mathcal{J}_n(^*) - v_i = \mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$. Let $u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_{n-2}$ denote the vertices of $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$ arranged in cyclic order.

Now, $J_{n,1} = \emptyset$ implies that $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$ has at least two pendant vertices and at most three pendant vertices u_j such that $u_{j-1}u_{j+1} \notin E(\mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*))$. Moreover such pendant vertices must be in consecutive order (in $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$).

Now, insert the vertex v_i into $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$ to recover $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$. Since $n \geq 7$ and $J_{n,1} = \emptyset$, v_i must be inserted in between two pendant vertices of $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$.

If there are only two such pendant vertices u_j and u_{j+1}, then either $u_j = v_{i-1}$, $u_{j+1} = v_{i+1}$ or else $u_j = v_{i+1}$, $u_{j-1} = v_{i-1}$. Either case implies that $v_{i-2}v_i, v_iv_{i+2} \in E(\mathcal{J}_n(^*))$.

If there are three such pendant vertices u_{j-1}, u_j and u_{j+1}, then again either $u_j = v_{i-1}$, $u_{j+1} = v_{i+1}$ or else $u_j = v_{i+1}$, $u_{j-1} = v_{i-1}$ and we have the same conclusion as before.

This proves the lemma. □.

Proposition 2 *Suppose F_n is a subgraph of the convex complete graph K_n with a Type-1 or Type-2 configuration $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$. Then $K_n - \mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ admits no triangulation for any natural number $n \geq 5$.*

Proof: We prove this by induction on n. The result is clearly true if $n = 5$. Hence we assume that $n \geq 6$ and that the result is true for all convex graphs $K_m - F_m$ where $m < n$.

By Lemma 1, $K_n - \mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ contains a vertex v_j such that $v_{j-1}v_{j+1} \notin E(\mathcal{J}_n(^*))$. By the definition of $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$, we see that $d_{\mathcal{J}_n(^*)}(v_j) \leq 2$.

Case (1): $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ is of Type-1.

In this case $d_{\mathcal{J}_n(^*)}(v_j) = 1$, and there is an edge $e \in \mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ satisfying $\mathcal{J}_n(^*) - e \cong \mathcal{F}_n(^*)$. Since $K_n - \mathcal{F}_n(^*)$ admits no triangulation, it follows that $K_n - \mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ admits no triangulation

Case (2): $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ is of Type-2.

(a) Suppose $J_{n,1} \neq \emptyset$.

In this case, let v_j which satisfies the condition $v_{j-1}v_{j+1} \notin E(\mathcal{J}_n(^*))$ be chosen such that $d_{\mathcal{J}_n(^*)}(v_j) = 1$.

Then $\mathcal{J}_n(^*) - v_j = \mathcal{J}_{n-1}(^*)$ in K_{n-1}. By induction, $K_{n-1} - \mathcal{J}_{n-1}(^*)$ admits no triangulation.

Assume on the contrary that $K_n - \mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ admits a triangulation T_n.

Suppose T_n contains $v_{j-1}v_{j+1}$. Then $T_n - v_j$ is a triangulation for $K_{n-1} - \mathcal{J}_{n-1}(^*)$, a contradiction.

Hence assume that T_n does not contain $v_{j-1}v_{j+1}$. Then T_n contains a diagonal v_jv_t. Let v_{j_1} be the neighbor of v_j in $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$.

Clearly v_jv_t divides $K_n - \mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ into two convex graphs $K_{m_1} - F_{m_1}$ and $K_{m_2} - F_{m_2}$ where $m_1 + m_2 = n + 2$. Without loss of generality assume that $v_jv_{j_1}$ is an edge in F_{m_1}. Note that $K_{m_2} - F_{m_2}$ admits a triangulation (since v_j is an isolated vertex in F_{m_2}).

If $J_{n,2} \cap V(F_{m_1}) = \emptyset$, then $F_{m_1} = \mathcal{F}_{m_1}(^*)$ which admits no triangulation by Proposition 1. Hence we assume that $J_{n,2} \cap V(F_{m_1})$ contains a vertex v_i.

(i) If both neighbors of v_i are in $V(F_{m_1})$, then F_{m_1} is $\mathcal{J}_{m_1}(^*)$. By induction, $K_{m_1} - F_{m_1}$ admits no triangulation and this implies that $K_n - \mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ admits no triangulation, a contradiction.

(ii) If only one of the neighbors of v_i is in $V(F_{m_1})$, then F_{m_1} is $\mathcal{F}_{m_1}(^*)$ and again we have a contradiction.

(iii) If both neighbors v_{i_1}, v_{i_2} of v_i are in $V(F_{m_2})$, then the edge v_jv_s (incident to the pendant vertex v_j) crosses both the edges $v_iv_{i_1}, v_iv_{i_2}$ with $|s - i_1| > 1$ and $|s - i_2| > 1$, a contradiction to the definition of Type-2 $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ configuration.

(b) Suppose $J_{n,1} = \emptyset$.

Then $v_j \in J_{n,2}$ and $\mathcal{J}_n(^*) - v_j = \mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$ in K_{n-1}. By Proposition 1, $K_{n-1} - \mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$ admits no triangulation.

When $n = 6$, $K_6 - \mathcal{J}_6(^*)$ admits no triangulation by Lemma 2.

When $n \geq 7$, assume on the contrary that $K_n - \mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ admits a triangulation T_n.

If T_n contains $v_{j-1}v_{j+1}$, then $T_n - v_j$ is a triangulation for $K_{n-1} - \mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$, a contradiction.

Hence assume that T_n does not contain $v_{j-1}v_{j+1}$. Then T_n contains a diagonal v_jv_t.

By Lemma 3, $v_{j-2}v_j,\ v_jv_{j+2} \in E(\mathcal{J}_n(^*))$ (since $n \geq 7$).

Clearly v_jv_t divides $K_n - \mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ into two convex graphs $K_{m_1} - F_{m_1}$ and $K_{m_2} - F_{m_2}$ where $m_1 + m_2 - 2 = n$ with F_{m_1} and F_{m_2} containing v_jv_{j-2} and v_jv_{j+2} respectively.

Note that $v_t \notin J_{n,2}$. This is because the vertex v_j in $\mathcal{J}_n(^*) - v_t$ is a non-pendant vertex and $v_{j-1}v_{j+1}$ is not an edge of $\mathcal{J}_n(^*) - v_t$ implying that $\mathcal{J}_n(^*) - v_t \neq \mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$.

If $V(F_{m_1}) \cap J_{n,2} = \emptyset$, then clearly F_{m_1} is $\mathcal{F}_{m_1}(^*)$. By Proposition 1, $K_{m_1} - \mathcal{F}_{m_1}(^*)$ admits no triangulation and this implies that $K_n - \mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ admits no triangulation, a contradiction.

Hence assume that there exists $v_i \in V(F_{m_1}) \cap J_{n,2}$. Clearly, v_i is adjacent to v_j in $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ (otherwise, the vertex v_j in $\mathcal{J}_n(^*) - v_i$ is a non-pendant vertex with $v_{j-1}v_{j+1} \notin (\mathcal{J}_n(^*) - v_i)$, and this implies that $\mathcal{J}_n(^*) - v_i \neq \mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$, a contradiction). Thus $i = j-2$.

We assert that $(F_{m_2} - v_j) \cap J_{n,2} = \emptyset$. To see this, suppose $v_r \in (F_{m_2} - v_j) \cap J_{n,2}$. By the same argument in the preceding paragraph (on v_i), it follows that v_r is adjacent to v_j and hence $v_r = v_{j+2}$. Moreover v_r is not adjacent to v_i (since $n \geq 7$). As such, $\mathcal{J}_n(^*) - v_r$ contains v_i with $v_{i-1}v_{i+1} \notin \mathcal{J}_n(^*) - v_r$ (and v_i is non-pendant) and this implies that $\mathcal{J}_n(^*) - v_i \neq \mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$, a contradiction.

It follows from the assertion that $F_{m_2} = \mathcal{F}_{m_2}(^*)$. By Proposition 1, $K_{m_2} - \mathcal{F}_{m_2}(^*)$ admit no triangulation and this implies that $K_n - \mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ admits no triangulation, a contradiction.

This completes the proof. □

Theorem 3 *Suppose $n \geq 5$ is a natural number and F_n is a subgraph of the convex complete graph K_n such that $|E(F_n)| = n-1$ and F_n contains no boundary edges of K_n. Then $K_n - F_n$ admits a triangulation unless F_n is Type-1 or Type-2 $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$.*

Proof: We prove the result by induction on n.

The result is clearly true if $n = 5, 6$. Assume that $n \geq 7$ and that the result is true for all convex graphs $K_m - F_m$ where $m < n$.

By Lemma 1, $K_n - F_n$ contains a vertex v_i such that $v_{i-1}v_{i+1} \notin E(F_n)$. $(*)$

Let v_i which satisfies the condition in $(*)$ be such that $d_{F_n}(v_i) = k$ is maximal.

Delete the vertex v_i from $K_n - F_n$. The resulting graph is a convex graph of the form $K_{n-1} - F_{n-1}$ where $F_{n-1} = F_n - v_i$ is a subgraph of K_{n-1}.

Case (1): $k \geq 3$.

Then $|E(F_{n-1})| \leq n-4$. By Theorem 2, $K_{n-1} - F_{n-1}$ admits a triangulation T_{n-1}. As such $T_{n-1} \cup \{v_{i-1}v_i, v_iv_{i+1}\}$ is a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$.

Case (2): $k = 2$.

If $F_{n-1} \neq \mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$, then $K_{n-1} - F_{n-1}$ admits a triangulation T_{n-1} by Theorem 2. Again $T_{n-1} \cup \{v_{i-1}v_i, v_iv_{i+1}\}$ is a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$.

Hence we assume that $F_{n-1} = \mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$.

Let v_{j_1} and v_{j_2} be the neighbors of v_i in F_n.

Now, there is an edge v_tv_s incident to a pendant vertex v_t such that v_tv_s crosses both the edges $v_iv_{j_1},\ v_iv_{j_1}$ with $|j_1 - s| > 1$ and $|j_2 - s| > 1$ (otherwise F_n is Type-2 $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$).

We can assume without loss of generality that $s < j_1 < j_2 < i$.

Let G_1 and G_2 be subgraphs of $K_n - F_n$ induced by the vertices $\{v_{j_1-1}, v_{j_1}, \ldots, v_{i-1}\}$ and $\{v_{i-1}, v_i, \ldots, v_{n-1}, v_0, \ldots, v_{j_1-1}\}$ respectively (with v_t contained in G_1). Clearly, $d_{G_1}(v_t) = 0$ and $d_{G_2}(v_i) = 0$ which imply that G_i admits a triangulation T_i, $i = 1, 2$. As such, $T = T_1 \cup T_2$ is a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$.

Case (3): $k = 1$.

Let v_j be the neighbor of v_i in F_n.

Then $d_{F_n}(v_j) \geq 2$ otherwise $K_{n-1} - F_{n-1}$ admits a triangulation T_{n-1} (because v_j is an isolated vertex in $K_{n-1} - F_{n-1}$) which means that $T_{n-1} \cup \{v_{i-1}v_i, v_iv_{i+1}\}$ is a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$.

By the maximality of k, we have $v_{j-1}v_{j+1} \in E(F_n)$.

Now, $|E(F_{n-1})| = n-2$. If F_{n-1} is not the configuration $\mathcal{J}_{n-1}(^*)$, then $K_{n-1} - F_{n-1}$ admits a triangulation T_{n-1} by induction. Again $T_{n-1} \cup \{v_{i-1}v_i, v_iv_{i+1}\}$ is a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$.

Hence we assume that $F_{n-1} \cong \mathcal{J}_{n-1}(^*)$.

(i) Suppose $\mathcal{J}_{n-1}(^*)$ is of Type-2.

Then there is a unique degree-2 vertex v_s in $\mathcal{J}_{n-1}(^*)$ such that $\mathcal{J}_{n-1}(^*) - v_s = \mathcal{F}_{n-2}(^*)$ (in $K_{n-2} = K_n - \{v_i, v_s\}$). It is easy to see that either $v_s = v_{i+1}$ or $v_s = v_{i-1}$. Assume without loss of generality that $v_s = v_{i+1}$. Hence $v_{i-1}v_{s+1}$ is not an edge in $\mathcal{J}_{n-1}(^*)$ (since $v_s \in J_{n-1,2}$).

In view of maximality of k, $v_{s-1}v_{s+1} \in E(F_n)$. Since $v_i = v_{s-1}$ is a pendant vertex, it follows that $v_j = v_{s+1}$.

Clearly, v_{i-1} is not adjacent to $v_j = v_{s+1}$. Hence $v_{i-1}v_j$ is a boundary edge in $K_{n-2} - \mathcal{F}_{n-2}(^*)$.

Let v_{s_1}, v_{s_2} be the neighbors of v_s in $\mathcal{J}_{n-1}(^*)$.

Since $v_{j-1}v_{j+1} = v_sv_{s+2}$ is an edge in F_n, we may assume that $v_{s+2} = v_{s_1}$, and hence $s_2 \geq s+3$.

By the maximality of k we see that v_{i-1} is a pendant vertex in F_n (since v_i is a pendant vertex and v_i is adjacent only to $v_j = v_{s+1}$). But this means that v_{i-1} is also a pendant vertex in $\mathcal{F}_{n-2}(^*)$.

Note that v_{s_1} is a non-pendant vertex in F_n (otherwise $\mathcal{J}_{n-1}(^*) - v_s$ contains an isolated vertex v_{s_1}, a contradiction).

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{F}_{n-2}(^*) \cup \{v_sv_{s_1}\} \cup \{v_iv_j\} = \mathcal{F}_n(^*)$. But then $\mathcal{F}_n(^*) \cup \{v_sv_{s_2}\} = F_n$ implying that F_n is a $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ configuration of Type-1, a contradiction.

(ii) Suppose $\mathcal{J}_{n-1}(^*)$ is of Type-1.

Then there is an edge e in $\mathcal{J}_{n-1}(^*)$ such that $\mathcal{J}_{n-1}(^*) - e$ is $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$.

We assert that v_{i-1}, v_{i+1} are both pendant vertices in F_n.

To see this suppose v_{i-1} is a non-pendant vertex in $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*)$. Then it follows from the maximality of k that $v_iv_{i-2} = v_iv_j$ is an edge of F_n. But this means that $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*) \cup \{v_iv_j\} = \mathcal{F}_n(^*)$ implying that F_n is a $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ configuration of Type-1 (because $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*) \cup \{v_iv_j\} \cup e = F_n$), a contradiction.

Hence let v_r and v_s be the neighbors of v_{i-1} and v_{i+1} in F_n respectively.

Suppose first that either (a) v_iv_j crosses neither $v_{i-1}v_r$ nor $v_{i+1}v_s$ or that (b) v_iv_j crosses $v_{i-1}v_r$ (or $v_{i+1}v_s$) with $|j-r| = 1$ (or $|j-s| = 1$). In any of these cases we have $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}(^*) \cup \{v_iv_j\} = \mathcal{F}_n(^*)$ implying that F_n is a $\mathcal{J}_n(^*)$ configuration of Type-1, a contradiction.

Hence assume without loss of generality that v_iv_j crosses $v_{i-1}v_r$ with $|j-r| > 1$. In this case, let G_1 and G_2 be the subgraphs of $K_n - F_n$ induced by the vertices $\{v_{j-1}, v_j, \ldots, v_{i-1}\}$ and $\{v_{i-1}, v_i, \ldots, v_{j-1}\}$ respectively. Clearly v_{i-1} and v_i are isolated vertex in G_1 and G_2 respectively. Hence G_i admits a triangulation T_i for each $i = 1, 2$. A triangulation of $K_n - F_n$ is given by $T = T_1 \cup T_2$.

This completes the proof. □

4 Potentially triangulable graphs

We now look at the possibility of packing a graph F with n vertices and n edges in the convex complete graph K_n so that $K_n - F$ admits a triangulation. We shall confine our attention to the case where F_n is a 2-regular graph. We begin with the following example.

Example 3 *Suppose F is a 7-cycle. If F is of the form $v_0v_2v_4v_6v_1v_3v_5v_0$ or of the form $v_0v_3v_6v_2v_5v_1v_4v_0$ in K_7. Then it is easy to see that $K_7 - F$ admits no triangulation. On*

the other hand, if F is of the form $v_0v_2v_6v_4v_1v_3v_5v_0$, then $K_7 - F$ admits a triangulation whose diagonals are $v_6v_1, v_1v_5, v_5v_2, v_2v_4$.

Definition 4 *Let K_n be a convex complete graph with n vertices. F is said to be potentially triangulable in K_n if there exists a configuration of F in K_n such that $K_n - F$ admits a triangulation.*

Theorem 4 *Suppose F_n is an n-cycle. Then F_n is potentially triangulable in K_n if and only if $n \geq 7$.*

Proof: It is easy to see that $K_n - F_n$ admits no triangulation if $n \leq 5$.

Suppose $K_6 - F_6$ admits a triangulation T. Since T has precisely 3 diagonals, there is a vertex v_i which is incident with 2 diagonals of T. But this is clearly a contradiction since $K_6 - (F_6 \cup v_0v_1v_2 \cdots v_5v_0)$ is 1-regular.

For $n = 7$, F_n is potentially triangulable in K_n by Example 3.

For the rest of the proof, we assume that $n \geq 8$.

Case (1): n is even.

Note that n can be written as $n = 2^s t$ for some positive natural number s and some positive odd natural number t. Let $\alpha = t + 2$. Then $gcd\ (t, \alpha) = 1$.

By relabeling the vertices if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that F_n takes the form

$$v_0v_\alpha v_{2\alpha}v_{3\alpha} \ldots v_{(n-1)\alpha}v_0.$$

Here the operation is reduced modulo n. That is, the edges of F_n are of the form v_iv_j where $j - i \in S_n = \{t + 2, n - t - 2\}$.

The subgraph G' induced by the vertices $v_0, v_2, v_4, \ldots, v_{n-2}$ is a convex complete graph $K_{n/2}$ (because it contains no edges from F_n). As such G' admits a triangulation T' (by Theorem 2). By adding the vertices $v_1, v_3, \ldots, v_{n-1}$ to T' together with the edges $v_0v_1v_2v_3 \ldots v_{n-1}v_0$, we have a triangulation of $K_n - F_n$.

Case (2): $n \geq 9$ is odd.

Let $\alpha = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ and let F_n take the form

$$v_0v_\alpha v_{2\alpha}v_{3\alpha} \ldots v_{(n-1)\alpha}v_0.$$

Here again, the operation is reduced modulo n. That is, the edges of F_n are of the form v_iv_j where $j - i \in S_n = \{(n-1)/2, (n+1)/2\}$.

Let $\beta = \lceil n/3 \rceil$. Consider the subgraphs G_0, G_1, G_2 induced by the sets of vertices $\{v_0, v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_\beta\}$, $\{v_\beta, v_{\beta+1}, v_{\beta+2}, \ldots, v_{2\beta}\}$ and $\{v_{2\beta}, v_{2\beta+1}, \ldots, v_0\}$ respectively. Then G_i, $i = 0, 1, 2$ is a convex complete subgraph of $K_n - F_n$ (because it contains no edges from F_n). Hence G_i admits a triangulation T_i, $i = 0, 1, 2$. As such, $T_0 \cup T_1 \cup T_2$ is a triangulation of $K_n - F_n$. □

Remark 1 *Let K_n be a convex complete graph with n vertices and let F be a union of k disjoint cycles in K_n where $|V(F)| = n-3 \geq 4$. It is easy to see that one can place these k cycles in K_n such that (i) no edge of F is a boundary edge of K_n, and (ii) there are three vertices $x, y, z \in V(K_n) - V(F)$ such that xy is a boundary edge of K_n and x, y, z separate $V(F)$ into two sets. Figure 1 illustrates an example where $n = 15$, $k = 3$ and $F = C_4 \cup C_3 \cup C_5$. Here the cycles are drawn with dashed lines. By Theorem 2, $K_n - F$ admits a triangulation (because $|E(F)| = n - 3$).*



Figure 1: A drawing of $K_{15} - (C_4 \cup C_3 \cup C_5)$.

Theorem 5 *Let F_n be a 2-regular graph with n vertices. Then F_n is potentially triangulable in K_n if and only if $F_n \notin \{C_3, C_4, C_5, C_6, C_3 \cup C_3, C_3 \cup C_4\}$.*

Proof: If F_n is connected, the result is true by Theorem 4. Hence we assume that F_n is a union of disjoint cycles.

Let the vertices of the convex complete graph K_n be denoted by $v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{n-1}$.

Since $K_6 - (C_3 \cup C_3 \cup v_0v_1v_2 \cdots v_5v_0)$ is 1-regular, it follows that $K_n - F_n$ admits no triangulation if $F_n = C_3 \cup C_3$.

Suppose $F_n = C_3 \cup C_4$ and assume that that $K_n - F_n$ admits a triangulation T. Since $K_n - F_n$ is a 2-regular graph, the graph D induced by the the diagonal edges of T is a path with 5 vertices. Assume without loss of generality that $D = v_1v_6v_2v_5v_3$. It follows that $v_0v_2v_4v_0 \subset F_n$. Consequently $E(C_4) \cap E(D) \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction.

For the rest of the proof, we assume that $n \geq 8$. Let C be a cycle in F_n and let $|V(C)| = p$. Also let $F^* = F_n - C$.

Case (1): $p \geq 8$.

(i) Suppose p is even. Use the method in Case (1) of the proof of Theorem 4 to construct a triangulation T_p of $K_p - C$. To obtain a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$, we do the following.

Assume first that $|V(F^*)| \geq 4$. Insert $n-p$ vertices into the edges v_0v_1, v_1v_2 so that these $n-p$ vertices together with v_0, v_1, v_2 form a convex complete graph K_{n-p+3}. Also, join each of these $n-p$ vertices to every vertex in K_p. We then place all the disjoint cycles F^* in K_{n-p+3} in the same manner as was done in Remark 1 (with v_0, v_2, v_1 playing the roles of x, y, z respectively) and obtain a triangulation T^* for $K_{n-p+3} - F^*$. Consequently, $T_p \cup T^*$ is a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$.

Now assume that F^* is a 3-cycle. Insert 3 vertices u, v, w into the edges v_0v_1, v_1v_2, v_2v_3 respectively so that $\{v_0, u, v_1, v, v_2, w, v_3\}$ becomes the vertex set of a convex complete graph K_7. Also, join u, v, w each to every vertex of K_p. Take $uvwu$ to be the 3-cycle F^*. Then $T_p \cup \{v_0uv_1vv_2wv_3\}$ is a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$.

(ii) Suppose p is odd. Use the method in Case (2) of the proof of Theorem 4 to construct a triangulation T_p of $K_p - C$. Recall that $T_p = T_0 \cup T_1 \cup T_2$ where T_i is a triangulation of G_i, $i = 0, 1, 2$. To obtain a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$, we do the following.

As before we first assume that $|V(F^*)| \geq 4$. Insert $n-p$ vertices into the edges v_0v_1, v_1v_2 so that these $n-p$ vertices together with v_0, v_1, v_2 form a convex complete graph K_{n-p+3}. Also, join each of these $n-p$ vertices to every vertex in K_p. We then place all the disjoint cycles F^* in K_{n-p+3} in the same manner as was done in Remark 1 (with v_0, v_2, v_1 playing the roles of x, y, z respectively) and obtain a triangulation T^* for $K_{n-p+3} - F^*$ (since v_0, v_1, v_2 are isolated vertices in $K_{n-p+3} - F^*$). Then $T_0 \cup T_1 \cup T_2 \cup T^*$ is a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$.

Now assume that F^* is a 3-cycle. Insert 3 vertices u, v, w into the edges v_0v_1, v_1v_2, v_2v_3 respectively so that $\{v_0, u, v_1, v, v_2, w, v_3\}$ becomes the vertex set of a convex complete graph K_7. Also, join u, v, w each to every vertex of K_p. Take $uvwu$ to be the 3-cycle F^*. Note that the subgraph induced by $\{v_0, u, v_1, v, v_2, w, v_3, \ldots, u_\beta\}$ (recall that $\beta = \lceil n/3 \rceil$) is of the form $K_{\beta+3} - F^*$ which admits a triangulation T_0^* (since $v_0, v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_\beta$ are isolated vertices in $K_{\beta+3} - F^*$). As such $T_0^* \cup T_1 \cup T_2$ is a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$.

Case (2): $p = 7$.

Let C be the 7-cycle $v_0v_3v_1v_6v_4v_2v_5v_0$. Let T_p be the triangulation of $K_7 - F_7$ with 4 diagonals $v_0v_2, v_2v_6, v_6v_3, v_3v_5$. Adopt the same method of construction as was done in Case (1)(i) to obtain a triangulation $T_p \cup T^*$ for $K_n - F_n$ if $|V(F^*)| \geq 4$ and a triangulation $T_p \cup \{v_0uv_1vv_2wv_3\}$ for $K_n - F_n$ if F^* is a 3-cycle.

Case (3): $p = 6$.

Let C be the 6-cycle $v_0v_2v_5v_3v_1v_4v_0$.

Assume first that $|V(F^*)| \geq 4$. Insert $n-p$ vertices into the edges v_0v_1, v_0v_5 so that these $n-p$ vertices together with v_0, v_1, v_5 form a convex complete graph K_{n-3}. We then place all the disjoint cycles F^* in this K_{n-3} in the same manner as was done in

Remark 1 (with v_5, v_1, v_0 playing the roles of x, y, z respectively). Also, join the vertices of F^* to every vertex in $v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_5$ to obtain the convex graph $K_n - F_n$. Let $V(F_1^*)$ and $V(F_2^*)$ denote the sets of vertices of F^* which are placed on the edges v_0v_1 and v_0v_5 respectively. Consider the subgraphs G_0 and G_1 induced by $V(F_1^*) \cup \{v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ and $V(F_2^*) \cup \{v_0, v_5, v_4, v_3\}$ respectively. By Theorem 1, G_i admits a triangulation T_i, $i = 0, 1$. Consequently, $T_0 \cup T_1 \cup \{v_0v_3\}$ is a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$.

Now suppose F^* is a 3-cycle. Here we take $F_n = C_6 \cup C_3$ where $C_6 = v_0v_3v_8v_5v_2v_6v_0$ and $C_3 = v_1v_4v_7v_1$. Then a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$ is given by the set of diagonals $\{v_5v_0, v_0v_7, v_7v_5, v_5v_1, v_1v_3, v_3v_5\}$.

Case (4): $p = 5$.

Let C be the 5-cycle $v_0v_2v_4v_1v_3v_0$.

Assume first that $|V(F^*)| \geq 4$. Insert $n-5$ vertices into the edges v_0v_1, v_1v_2 so that these $n-5$ vertices together with v_0, v_1, v_2 form a convex complete graph K_{n-2}. We then place all the disjoint cycles F^* in this K_{n-2} in the same manner as was done in Remark 1 (with v_0, v_2, v_1 playing the roles of x, y, z respectively). Also, join all these $n-5$ vertices to each of the vertex in $\{v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_4\}$ so that the resulting convex graph is $K_n - F_n$. Let v_0w be the boundary edge of K_{n-2} where $w \in V(F^*)$. Let G^* denote the subgraph of $K_n - F_n$ induced by the vertices $V(F^*) \cup \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$. Since v_2 is an isolated vertex in G^*, G^* admits a triangulation T^*. As such $T^* \cup \{wv_0, v_0v_4, v_4w, v_3v_4\}$ is a triangulation of $K_n - F_n$.

Hence assume that F^* is a 3-cycle. Here we take $F_n = C_5 \cup C_3$ where $C_5 = v_0v_3v_6v_2v_5v_0$ and $C_3 = v_1v_4v_7v_1$. Then a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$ is given by the set of diagonals $\{v_0v_2, v_2v_4, v_4v_0, v_0v_6, v_4v_6\}$.

Case (5): $p = 4$.

In view of the preceding cases, we may assume that F_n is a disjoint union of cycles each of length at most 4.

Suppose $F_n = C_4 \cup C_4$. Then we may take F_n to be the two disjoint 4-cycles given by $v_0v_2v_5v_3v_0$ and $v_1v_6v_4v_7v_1$. Then a triangulation for $K_8 - F_8$ is given by the set of diagonals $v_1v_3, v_1v_4, v_1v_5, v_5v_0, v_5v_7$.

Hence we assume that $|V(F^*)| \geq 6$. Take a convex complete graph K_{n-1} and place all the disjoint cycles F^* in K_{n-1} in the same manner as was done in Remark 1. Now insert a new vertex w on a boundary edge incident to z and join w to all vertices of K_{n-1} to obtain a convex complete graph K_n. Let C denote the cycle $xzywx$. Let $V(F_1^*)$ denote the set of vertices in F^* which are placed on the boundary edge xz, and let $V(F_2^*)$ denote the set of vertices in F^* which are placed on the boundary edge wy.

Let $x_1 \in V(F_1^*)$ and $x_2 \in V(F_2^*)$ such that x_1x_2 is not an edge in F^*. Partition $K_n - F_n$ into three convex graphs G_1, G_2 and G_3 induced by the vertices $\{x_1, \ldots, z\}$, $\{z, \ldots, x_2\}$ and $\{x_2, \ldots, y, x, \ldots, x_1\}$. Then it is easy to see that z is an isolated in G_1 and G_2 and each x and y is an isolated vertex in G_3. Let T_i denote a triangulation of

G_i, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$ is given by $T_1 \cup T_2 \cup T_3$.

Case (6): $p = 3$.

In view of the preceding results, we just need to consider the case $F_n = C_3 \cup C_3 \cup \cdots \cup C_3$ and $n \geq 9$.

Let $\alpha = n/3$ and take $F_n = \{v_i v_{i+\alpha} v_{i+2\alpha} v_i \mid i = 0, 1, \ldots, \alpha - 1\}$.

For $i = 0, 1, 2$, let G_i denote the convex complete subgraph induced by the vertices $v_{i(\alpha-1)}, v_{i(\alpha-1)+1}, \ldots, v_{(i+1)(\alpha-1)}$. Also, let G_3 denote the convex complete subgraph induced by the vertices $v_{3(\alpha-1)}, v_{3\alpha-2}, \ldots, v_0$.

Each G_i, $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$ admits a triangulation T_i if $n \geq 12$. Hence $T_0 \cup T_1 \cup T_2 \cup T_3 \cup \{v_0 v_{\alpha-1} v_{2(\alpha-1)} v_{3(\alpha-1)} v_0, v_0 v_{2(\alpha-1)}\}$ yields a triangulation for $K_n - F_n$ if $n \geq 12$. If $n = 9$, a triangulation for $K_9 - F_9$ is given by the diagonals $\{v_0 v_2, v_2 v_4, v_4 v_0, v_4 v_6, v_6 v_8, v_8 v_4\}$.

This completes the proof. □

5 Regular graphs

In view of the results in the preceding section, it is natural to ask which regular graph is potentially triangulable in K_n.

Problem 1 *Let $r \geq 3$ be a natural number and let G be an r-regular graph with n vertices. It is true that there is a natural number $n_0(r)$ such that when $n \geq n_0(r)$, then G is potentially triangulable in the convex complete graph K_n?*

We believe that the above problem is true. However we do not have a complete answer for this even when restricted to the case $r = 3$. Nevertheless we offer the following special case of a 3-regular graph which is well-known in the literature.

Suppose n and k are two integers such that $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ and $n \geq 5$. The *generalized Petersen graph* $P(n, k)$ is defined to have vertex-set $\{a_i, b_i : i = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ and edge-set $E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3$ where $E_1 = \{a_i a_{i+1} : i = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$, $E_2 = \{b_i b_{i+k} : i = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ and $E_3 = \{a_i b_i : i = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ with subscripts reduced modulo n. Edges in E_3 are called the spokes of $P(n, k)$.

Proposition 3 *Suppose $1 \leq k < n/2$. Then the generalized Petersen graph $P(n, k)$ is potentially triangulable in the convex complete graph K_{2n} where $n \geq 5$.*

Proof: Let the vertices of K_{2n} be denoted $v_1, v_2, v_3, \ldots, v_{2n}$. We shall pack $P(n, k)$ on K_{2n} so that $K_{2n} - P(n, k)$ admits a triangulation.

Case (1): $k = 1$

In this case, $P(n, 1)$ consists of two n-cycles $C = a_0 a_1 a_2 \cdots c_{n-1} a_0$ and $C' = b_0 b_1 b_2 \cdots b_{n-1} b_0$ together with the edges $a_i b_i$, $i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$.

If n is even, we place C on K_{2n} so that C takes the form

$$v_1 v_{3n/2} v_2 v_{(3n-2)/2} v_3 v_{(3n-4)/2} \cdots v_{(n-2)/2} v_{n+2} v_{n/2} v_{n+1} v_1$$

and that C' takes the form

$$v_{(3n+2)/2} v_n v_{(3n+4)/2} v_{n-1} v_{(3n+6)/2} v_{n-2} \cdots v_{(n+4)/2} v_{2n} v_{(n+2)/2} v_{(3n+2)/2}$$

with spokes given by $v_{(3n+2i)/2} v_i,\ i = 1, 2, \ldots, n/2$ and $v_{(3n-2i)/2} v_{n-i},\ i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, n/2 - 1$.

If n is odd, we place C on K_{2n} so that C takes the form

$$v_1 v_{(3n-1)/2} v_2 v_{(3n-3)/2} v_3 v_{(3n-5)/2} \cdots v_{n+2} v_{(n-1)/2} v_{n+1} v_{(n+1)/2} v_1$$

and that C' takes the form

$$v_{(3n+1)/2} v_n v_{(3n+3)/2} v_{n-1} v_{(3n+5)/2} v_{n-2} \cdots v_{2n-1} v_{(n+3)/2} v_{2n} v_{(3n+1)/2}$$

with spokes given by $v_{(3n+2i-1)/2} v_i,\ \ i = 1, 2, \ldots, (n+1)/2,$ and $v_{(3n-2i-1)/2} v_{n-i},$ $i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, (n-3)/2$.

In both cases consider the subgraph graphs G_1 and G_2 induced by the sets of vertices $\{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$ and $\{v_{n+1}, v_{n+2}, \ldots, v_{2n-1}, v_{2n}\}$ respectively. Since the vertex v_2 in G_1 (likewise the vertex v_{n+1} in G_2) is not incident with any edges from G_1 (respectively G_2) since $n \geq 5$, G_i admits a triangulation T_i, $i = 1, 2$. A triangulation of $K_{2n} - P(n, 1)$ is given by $T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v_n v_{2n}, v_1 v_{2n}, v_n v_{n+1}\}$.

Case (2): $1 < k < n/2$

Place E_1 and E_2 on K_{2n} so that E_1 takes the form $v_2 v_4 v_6 \ldots v_{2n-2} v_{2n} v_2$, E_2 takes the form $\{v_i v_{i+2k} \ : \ i = 1, 3, \ldots, 2n-1\}$ and E_3 takes the form $\{v_{2i} v_{2i+3} \ : \ i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Here the operations on the subscripts are reduced modulo $2n$.

Consider the subgraph G induced by the vertices $\{v_4, v_5, v_6, \ldots, v_{2n-3}\} \cup \{v_0, v_1, v_{2n-1}\}$. Since the vertex v_0 is not adjacent to every vertex in G, G admits a triangulation T_G. Then $T_G \cup \{v_1 v_2 v_3 v_4\} \cup \{v_1 v_3\} \cup \{v_{2n-3} v_{2n-2} v_{2n-1}\}$ is a triangulation for $K_{2n} - P(n, k)$.

This completes the proof. □

6 An application

The skewness of a graph G, denoted $sk(G)$, is the minimum number of edges to be deleted from G such the resulting graph is planar. In [6], Kainen proves that all graphs G with $sk(G) \leq 2$ are 5-colorable (and the result is best possible). Also, in the same paper he proves that if $sk(G) \leq 5$, then G is 6-colorable. In the following year, in [7], it was shown that if $sk(G) < \binom{k}{2}$, then G is $(2+k)$-colorable for $k \geq 3$. This result was generalized to other orientable surfaces in [9].

For more details about the notion of skewness of a graph and for some recent results, the reader may consult the papers [2], [3] and [4].

Definition 5 *The geometric skewness of a geometric graph G, denoted $sk_g(G)$ is the minimum number of edges to be removed from G so that the resulting graph can be redrawn as a geometric planar graph. The convex skewness of a convex graph G, denoted $sk_c(G)$ is the minimum number of edges to be removed from G so that the resulting graph is a convex plane graph.*

Theorem 6 *For any geometric graph G, $sk_g(G) = sk(G)$.*

Proof: The proof follows immediately from Fáry's theorem ([5]) which states that any simple planar graph can be drawn on the plane without crossings so that its edges are straight line segments. □

Proposition 4 *Let F be a subgraph of a convex complete graph K_n. Suppose $K_n - F$ admits a triangulation. Then $sk_c(K_n - F) = \binom{n-2}{2} - |E(F)|$.*

Proof: It is known that the number of edges in a triangulation T of a convex n-gon is $2n-3$ (with $n-3$ of them being non-boundary edges). If any new straight line segment is added to the triangulation, it will intersect with some non-boundary edge of T. Hence, if $K_n - F$ admits a triangulation, then we have $sk_c(K_n - F) = |E(K_n)| - |E(F)| - (2n-3)$ which yields $sk_c(K_n - F) = \binom{n-2}{2} - |E(F)|$. □

References

[1] A. Aichholzer, S. Cabella, R. Fabila-Monroy, D. Flores-Peñaloza, T. Hackl, C. Huemer, F. Hurtado and D.R. Wood, Edge-removal and non-crossing configurations and geometric graph, *Discrete Maths. & Theorectical Comput. Sci.,* **12** (2010) 75–86.

[2] G.L. Chia and C.L. Lee, Skewness and crossing numbers of graphs, *Bull. Inst. Combin. Appl.* Vol. 55 (2009) 17–32.

[3] G.L. Chia and K.A. Sim, On the skewness of the join of two graphs, *Discrete Appl. Math.* Vol. 161. (2013) 2405 – 2409.

[4] R.J. Cimikowski, Graph planarization and skewness, *Congr. Numer.* **88** (1992) 21–32.

[5] I. Fáry, On straight-line representation of planar graphs, *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)*, **11** (1948) 229 - 233.

[6] P.C. Kainen, A generalization of the 5-color theorem, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.,* **45** (1974) 450–453.

[7] P.C. Kainen, Chromatic number and skewness, *J. Combinat. Theory*, **18** (1975) 32–34.

[8] E.L. Lloyd, On triangulations on a set of points in the plane, *Proc. of IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, IEEE (1977) 228-240.

[9] H. Pahlings, On the chromatic number of skew graphs, *J. Combinat. Theory*, **25** (1978) 303-306.